

REMARKS

Claims 1-7 remain pending in the application. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections in view of the remarks contained herein.

If the Examiner relies on a new ground of rejection or a new reference in rejecting the Claims in the next Office Action, a Final Office Action would not be appropriate since there are no amendments that change the scope of the claims. Under present practice, second or subsequent actions on the merits shall be final, except where the Examiner introduces a new ground of rejection that is not necessitated by Applicants' amendment of the claims. **See MPEP § 706.07(a).**

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-2 and 4-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Onozawa (JP First Publication No. H11-095324). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 recites a projector comprising: an ultrasonic speaker; a visual information generation unit that generates visual information relating to a sound reproduction range of the ultrasonic speaker; and an image projection unit that displays the visual information generated by the visual information generation unit on a screen.

Independent claim 5 recites a method for displaying sound reproduction range in a projector equipped with an ultrasonic speaker, the method comprising the steps of: generating visual information relating to a sound reproduction range of the ultrasonic

speaker; and displaying the visual information generated in the step of generating visual information on a screen.

For anticipation to be present under 35 U.S.C §102(b), there must be no difference between the claimed invention and the reference disclosure as viewed by one skilled in the field of the invention. Scripps Clinic & Res. Found. V. Genentech, Inc., 18 USPQ.2d 1001 (Fed. Cir. 1991). All of the limitations of the claim must be inherent or expressly disclosed and must be arranged as in the claim. Constant v. Advanced Micro-Devices, Inc., 7 USPQ.2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Here, Onozawa fails to disclose the limitation of “visual information relating to a sound reproduction range of the ultrasonic speaker” as claims 1 and 5 recite.

More particularly, the Office Action states that element 11 in FIG. 1 of Onozawa “generates visual information relating to a sound reproduction range of the ultrasonic speaker.” See the Office Action at page 2. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Onozawa discloses a projector which enables a user to set the size of the display screen by selecting the size of the screen from a menu. See Onozawa at paragraphs [0001], [0003], and [0018]. According to Onozawa, the user “looks at the menu screen shown in FIG. 5, and uses the operation unit 11 to adjust the optical axis, the focus, and the like.” See Onozawa at paragraph [0012]. Thus, Onozawa does not state that the operation unit 11 “generates visual information relating to a sound reproduction range of the ultrasonic speaker.”

The Office Action further states that element 24 in FIG. 3 of Onozawa corresponds to the ultrasonic speaker recited in claims 1, 5, and 7 of the instant application. Applicant again respectfully disagrees. According to the present

application, “visual information relating to a sound production range of the ultrasonic speaker” is generated and displayed. See Applicant’s specification, Claims 1 and 5. In contrast, element 24 in FIG. 3 of Onozawa emits an ultrasonic signal towards a screen S, which is used to measure the distance between the projector and the screen S. See Onozawa at paragraphs [0002] and [0015]. Thus, the “visual information relating to a sound production range” of element 24 in Onozawa is neither generated nor displayed. Therefore, the Office Action’s reference to element 24 in Onozawa is out of context. Accordingly, element 24 in Onozawa does not correspond to the ultrasonic speaker claimed in the present application.

In view of the foregoing, it can be appreciated that the invention recited in independent claims 1 and 5 of the present application differs from the teachings of Onozawa in that “a visual information relating to a sound reproduction range of the ultrasonic speaker” is generated and displayed. Onozawa does not disclose or suggest the concept of generating “a visual information relating to a sound reproduction range of the ultrasonic speaker.” The claimed invention is novel and nonobvious and the above feature allows a user to set up a projector with ease, by viewing the images representing the sound reproduction range. See Applicant’s Specification at 3, ll. 7-16.

Inasmuch as the Onozawa fails to teach or suggest all of the claim limitations, Onozawa cannot anticipate claims 1 and 5. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 2 and 4 depend on claim 1 and should be in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons as set forth above.

Claims 6-7 depend on claim 5 and should be in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons as set forth above.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Onozawa (JP First Publication No. H11-095324) in view of Matsuzawa et al. (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2006/0033882). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 3 depends from claim 1 and should be in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons as set forth above.

STATEMENT OF COMMON OWNERSHIP

The present application (serial number 10/589,685) and Matsuzawa et al. (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2006/0033882) were, at the time the invention of the present application (serial number 10/589,685) was made, commonly owned by Seiko Epson Corporation.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner

believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: November 24, 2009

By: /G. Gregory Schivley/
G. Gregory Schivley
Reg. No. 27,382
Bryant E. Wade
Reg. No. 40,344

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

GGs/BEW/pvd